



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/000,155	10/30/2001	Eliyahou Harari	M-10187-44C US	8242
36257	7590	07/05/2006	EXAMINER	
PARSONS HSUE & DE RUNTZ LLP 595 MARKET STREET SUITE 1900 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105			MAI, SON LUU	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2827	

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**MAILED**

JUL 5 2006

**GROUP 2800**

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/000,155  
Filing Date: October 30, 2001  
Appellant(s): HARARI ET AL.

---

Gerald P. Parsons  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 03/20/2006 appealing from the Office action  
mailed 05/19/2005.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

No evidence is relied upon by the examiner in the rejection of the claims under appeal.

### **(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 63-103 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In the independent claims 63, 82, 85, 87, 89, 91, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, and 103, the specification lacks support for the claimed subject matter: address cells for storing addresses. Regarding claim 63, lines 2-4, the recitation of “a memory array comprising a plurality of groups of data cells and address cells, said cells in each of said groups of data cells and address cells respectively storing data and addresses” lacks support for groups of address cells storing addresses. The specification on pages 16 and 17 only depicts “a typical sector 401 organized into a data portion 403 and a spare (or shadow) portion 405” and “the spare portion 405 is further organized into an alternative defects data area 407, a defect map area 409, a header area 411 and an ECC and others area 413.” There are no description about address cells for storing addresses. Other independent claims 82, 85, 87, 89, 91, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, and 103 recite the same limitation and suffer the same deficiency. Therefore, the specification fails to describe groups of address cells for storing address in a memory array.

### **(10) Response to Argument**

The appellant's argument respect to all of the claims is about the support for “groups of ...cells...storing addresses” as in the typical claim 98. To support for the claimed subject matter, the appellant cites the specification at page 17, lines 6-8, “the

addresses of the defective cell and the backup cell are stored as defect pointers in the defect map 409." The appellant concludes the recitation providing support for "a group of cells for storing addresses".

On the contrary, the Examiner believes that the specification at page 17, lines 6-8, only describes the addresses of the defective cell and the backup cell stored as defect pointers in the defect map 409. The defect pointers are not address cells for storing addresses as claimed in claims 63, 82, 85, 87, 89, 91, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, and 103. The specification does not mention about address cells and storing addresses as claimed, but only about the addresses ...stored as defect pointers.

#### **(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**


The appeal brief filed 03/20/2006 does not include an evidence appendix or a related proceedings appendix. The Examiner assumes that there is no evidence submitted by the appellant and no related proceedings since there are no related proceedings listed in the related appeals and interferences section and it is assumed that the appellant meant to include both appendixes with a statement of "NONE." See MPEP 1205.02-1205.03.

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Son L. Mai

 06/20/06

Application/Control Number: 10/000,155  
Art Unit: 2827

Page 5

Conferees:

Ricky Mack 

Amir Zarabian 